United States Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C. 20460

Water Compliance Inspection Report

Section A: National Data System Coding (i.e., PCS)

Transaction Code	NPDES	yr/mo/day	Inspection Type	Inspector	Fac Type
1 N	WAU0003831	100331	=	R	3

Remarks

21 ____ 66

Inspection Work Days	Facility Self-Monitoring Evaluation Rating	BI	QA	Reserved
67 ___ 69	70	71	72	73 74 75 ____ 80

Section B: Facility Data

Name and Location of Facility Inspected *(For industrial users discharging to POTW, also include POTW name and NPDES permit number)*

Sytsma Brothers Dairy
490 W. Laurel Road
Bellingham, WA 98226

Entry Time/Date: 3/31/10 2:10 PM
Permit Effective Date:
Exit Time/Date: 3/31/10 3:40 PM
Permit Expiration Date:

Name(s) of On-Site Representative(s)/Title(s)/Phone and Fax Number(s)

Andy Sytsma, Owner / Operator (b) (6)

Fred Sytsma, Owner / Operator (b) (6)

Other Facility Data *(e.g., SIC NAICS, and other descriptive information)*

SIC = 0241

Name, Address of Responsible Official/Title/Phone and Fax Number

Andy Sytsma, Owner / Operator (b) (6)
Fred Sytsma, Owner / Operator (b) (6)
490 W. Laurel Road
Bellingham, WA 98226

Contacted: ☑ Yes ☐ No

Section C: Areas Evaluated During Inspection *(Check only those areas evaluated)*

☐ Permit	☐ Self-Monitoring Program	☐ Pretreatment	☐ MS4
☐ **Records/Reports**	☐ Compliance Schedules	☐ Pollution Prevention	
✓ Facility Site Review	☐ Laboratory	☐ Storm Water	
✓ Effluent/Receiving Waters	✓ Operations & Maintenance	☐ Combined Sewer Overflow	
☐ Flow Measurement	☐ Sludge Handling/Disposal	☐ Sanitary Sewer Overflow	

Section D: Summary of Findings/Comments

(Attach additional sheets of narrative and checklists, including Single Event Violation codes, as necessary)

SEV Codes / SEV Description

See attached report

Name(s) and Signature(s) of Inspector(s)	Agency/Office/Phone and Fax Numbers	Date
Dustan Bott Dustin Bott	EPA/OCE/IEMU (206) 553-5502	4/9/10
Kristie McNeill	EPA/OCE/IEMU (206) 553-6291	
Signature of Management QA Reviewer	Agency/Office/Phone and Fax Numbers	Date
Josh D. Kb		07/27/10

EPA Form 3560-3 (Rev 1-06) Previous editions are obsolete.

PCS WAU000383

PCS
4-12-2010
JB

INSTRUCTIONS

Section A: National Data System Coding *(i.e., PCS)*

Column 1: Transaction Code: Use N, C, or D for New, Change, or Delete. All inspections will be *new* unless there is an error in the data entered.

Columns 3-11: NPDES Permit No. Enter the facility's NPDES permit number - third character in permit number indicates permit type for U=unpermitted, G=general permit, etc.. *(Use the Remarks columns to record the State permit number, if necessary.)*

Columns 12-17: Inspection Date. Insert the date entry was made into the facility. Use the year/month/day format (e.g., 04/10/01 = October 01, 2004).

Column 18: Inspection Type*. Use one of the codes listed below to describe the type of inspection:

- A Performance Audit
- B Compliance Biomonitoring
- C Compliance Evaluation (non-sampling)
- D Diagnostic
- F Pretreatment (Follow-up)
- G Pretreatment (Audit)
- I Industrial User (IU) Inspection
- J Complaints
- M Multimedia
- N Spill
- O Compliance Evaluation (Oversight)
- P Pretreatment Compliance Inspection
- R Reconnaissance
- S Compliance Sampling
- U IU Inspection with Pretreatment Audit
- X Toxics Inspection
- Z Sludge - Biosolids
- # Combined Sewer Overflow-Sampling
- $ Combined Sewer Overflow-Non-Sampling
- + Sanitary Sewer Overflow-Sampling
- & Sanitary Sewer Overflow-Non-Sampling
- \ CAFO-Sampling
- = CAFO-Non-Sampling
- 2 IU Sampling Inspection
- 3 IU Non-Sampling Inspection
- 4 IU Toxics Inspection
- 5 IU Sampling Inspection with Pretreatment
- 6 IU Non-Sampling Inspection with Pretreatment
- 7 IU Toxics with Pretreatment
- ! Pretreatment Compliance (Oversight)
- @ Follow-up (enforcement)
- { Storm Water-Construction-Sampling
- } Storm Water-Construction-Non-Sampling
- : Storm Water-Non-Construction-Sampling
- ~ Storm Water-Non-Construction-Non-Sampling
- < Storm Water-MS4-Sampling
- - Storm Water-MS4-Non-Sampling
- > Storm Water-MS4-Audit

Column 19: Inspector Code. Use one of the codes listed below to describe the *lead agency* in the inspection.

- A — State (Contractor)
- B — EPA (Contractor)
- E — Corps of Engineers
- J — Joint EPA/State Inspectors—EPA Lead
- L — Local Health Department (State)
- N — NEIC Inspectors
- O — Other Inspectors, Federal/EPA (Specify in Remarks columns)
- P — Other Inspectors, State (Specify in Remarks columns)
- R — EPA Regional Inspector
- S — State Inspector
- T — Joint State/EPA Inspectors—State lead

Column 20: Facility Type. Use one of the codes below to describe the facility.

- 1 — Municipal. Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) with 1987 Standard Industrial Code (SIC) 4952.
- 2 — Industrial. Other than municipal, agricultural, and Federal facilities.
- 3 — Agricultural. Facilities classified with 1987 SIC 0111 to 0971.
- 4 — Federal. Facilities identified as Federal by the EPA Regional Office.
- 5 — Oil & Gas. Facilities classified with 1987 SIC 1311 to 1389.

Columns 21-66: Remarks. These columns are reserved for remarks at the discretion of the Region.

Columns 67-69: Inspection Work Days. Estimate the total work effort (to the nearest 0.1 work day), up to 99.9 days, that were used to complete the inspection and submit a QA reviewed report of findings. This estimate includes the accumulative effort of all participating inspectors; any effort for laboratory analyses, testing, and remote sensing; and the billed payroll time for travel and pre and post inspection preparation. This estimate does not require detailed documentation.

Column 70: Facility Evaluation Rating. Use information gathered during the inspection (regardless of inspection type) to evaluate the quality of the facility self-monitoring program. Grade the program using a scale of 1 to 5 with a score of 5 being used for very reliable self-monitoring programs, 3 being satisfactory, and 1 being used for very unreliable programs.

Column 71: Biomonitoring Information. Enter D for static testing. Enter F for flow through testing. Enter N for no biomonitoring.

Column 72: Quality Assurance Data Inspection. Enter Q if the inspection was conducted as followup on quality assurance sample results. Enter N otherwise.

Columns 73-80: These columns are reserved for regionally defined information.

Section B: Facility Data

This section is self-explanatory except for "Other Facility Data," which may include new information not in the permit or PCS (e.g., new outfalls, names of receiving waters, new ownership, other updates to the record, SIC/NAICS Codes, Latitude/Longitude).

Section C: Areas Evaluated During Inspection

Check only those areas evaluated by marking the appropriate box. Use Section D and additional sheets as necessary. Support the findings, as necessary, in a brief narrative report. Use the headings given on the report form (e.g., Permit, Records/Reports) when discussing the areas evaluated during the inspection.

Section D: Summary of Findings/Comments

Briefly summarize the inspection findings. This summary should abstract the pertinent inspection findings, not replace the narrative report. Reference a list of attachments, such as completed checklists taken from the NPDES Compliance Inspection Manuals and pretreatment guidance documents, including effluent data when sampling has been done. Use extra sheets as necessary.

*Footnote: In addition to the inspection types listed above under column 18, a state may continue to use the following wet weather and CAFO inspection types until the state is brought into ICIS-NPDES: K: CAFO, V: SSO, Y: CSO, W: Storm Water 9: MS4. States may also use the new wet weather, CAFO and MS4 inspections types shown in column 18 of this form. The EPA regions are required to use the new wet weather, CAFO, and MS4 inspection types for inspections with an inspection date (DTIN) on or after July 1, 2005.

NPDES
Inspection Report

Sytsma Brothers Dairy
Bellingham, WA

Prepared by:

Dustan Bott
Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10
Office of Compliance and Enforcement
Inspection and Enforcement Management Unit

[Unless otherwise noted, all details in this inspection report were obtained from conversations with Fred Sytsma, or from observations made during the inspection.]

I. Facility Information

Facility Name:	Sytsma Brothers Dairy
Facility Contact(s):	Fred and Andy Sytsma, Owners and Operators 490 W Laurel Road Bellingham, WA 98226 Andy's Phone: (b) (6) Fred's Phone: (b) (6)
SIC Code Facility Type:	0241 Dairy Farms
Facility Location:	490 W Laurel Road Bellingham, WA 98226
Mailing Address:	490 W Laurel Road Bellingham, WA 98226

II. Inspection Information

Inspection Date:	March 31, 2010
Inspectors:	Dustan Bott, Inspector EPA Region 10, OCE / IEMU (206) 553-5502 Kristie McNeill, Inspector EPA Region 10, OCE / IEMU (206) 553-6291 Eric Bair Washington State Department of Agriculture (WSDA) (509) 969-7140
Arrival Time:	2:10 PM
Departure Time:	5:15 PM
Weather Condition:	Overcast with some periods of sunshine.

Purpose: The inspection was conducted to document the facility's compliance with the Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation (CAFO) Regulations pursuant to the Clean Water Act (CWA).

III. Owner and Operator Information

Sytsma Brothers Dairy is owned and operated by Fred and Andy Sytsma (b) (6). The land the Dairy is located on is owned by Louie Sytsma (b) (6).

IV. Inspection Entry

This was an unannounced NPDES inspection. Kristie McNeill, Eric Bair and I arrived at Sytsma Dairy Farm at 2:10 PM on Wednesday, March 31, 2010 to conduct the inspection.

Upon arrival at the facility, we were greeted by Andy Sytsma. At this time, Kristie and I identified ourselves as EPA inspectors and presented our credentials to Mr. Sytsma. I informed him that the purpose of this visit was to conduct a compliance inspection to determine compliance with the facility's NPDES CAFO permit. He told us that he had an appointment to go to at that time, but Fred was coming there soon to do some work and that we could walk around the facility until he got there. Fred arrived at the facility at 2:45 PM. We identified ourselves and informed him of our discussion with Andy. We informed Fred of the purpose of our visit, and Kristie and I presented our credentials to Fred at this time. We were not denied access to the facility.

V. Scope of Inspection

This inspection consisted of an opening conference to conduct initial introductions and to discuss the purpose and expectations of the inspection; file review, facility tour and a closing conference to discuss compliance related concerns.

After the opening conference with Fred Sytsma, we proceeded to conduct a tour of the dairy farm facility. The facility tour consisted of an inspection of the barns where cows are confined, the feed storage area, chemical storage area, and the facility waste handling systems.

Following the facility tour, we conducted a file review with Fred in their office. We checked the Animal Waste Management Plan (AWMP), soil test results and land application records.

VI. Background and Facility Description

Sytsma Brothers Dairy is a designated medium sized CAFO dairy operation that has been in operation for 30 years. According to the current Animal Waste Management Plan (AWMP), this dairy is permitted for 300 milking cows, 60 dry cows, and 40 heifers and calves. At the time of this inspection, Fred Sytsma indicated that the current animal numbers at the facility were 110 milkers, 40 dry cows, and 130 heifers and calves.

The nearest waterway to the Sytsma Dairy Farm property is an unnamed ditch approximately 75 ft from lagoon 2 (See photo 7, which is an aerial view of the Dairy). The unnamed ditch drains into Ten Mile Creek.

The total acreage the Sytsma Dairy Farm operates on that is owned by Louie Sytsma is 70 acres, of which about 50 acres is used for land application. The Dairy leases about 200 acres nearby that is also used for land application.

According to Fred, the animals are confined year round. The confinement areas have concrete floors and the majority of the confinement area is in the covered barns.

The waste handling system at the main facility consists of a series of two lagoons (see photos 1, 2, and 3), and a pit (see photo 4) that they dug to drain the water in one of their silage storage areas (see photo 5). There is also a 12,000 gallon underground tank that collects wash water from the milk parlor that is then pumped to the lagoons. The lagoons are located adjacent to each other and are separated by an earthen wall. They are connected by an overflow pipe in the earthen wall that manure can flow through from the first to the second lagoon. The overflow pipe was not functioning at the time of our inspection and there was no freeboard in the west lagoon. The liquid waste from the lagoons is pumped out into a tanker and then land applied. According to Fred, the Dairy has approximately 6 months of storage capacity.

VII. Areas of Concern

We inspected the facility including the confinement areas and the waste handling system. Observations during the inspection included the identification of two areas of concern. These areas of concern is described as follows.

Waste level in storage lagoon #1.

A. Although I did not see a waste discharge at the time of inspection I observed high levels of waste in both of the storage lagoons. See Attachment A, Photo 1, 2, and 3. Each lagoon appeared to be full. Lagoon 1 had approximately 2 inches of freeboard. Lagoon 2 had more room for additional waste but the overflow pipe from Lagoon 1 to Lagoon 2 was blocked and not functioning at the time of the inspection. The dike separating the

two lagoons has been cut into to try and allow flow from Lagoon #1 to Lagoon #2, but that was not flowing at the time of the inspection. The nearest waterway, an unnamed ditch which runs into Ten Mile Creek is about 75ft from the lagoons.

Pit near ditch used for silage storage waste water.

B. According to Fred, more waste storage was needed so they dug a pit near the unnamed ditch (see photo 4). This pit is approximately 35 feet from the unnamed ditch. Water from one of the silage storage areas (see photos 5 and 6) is pumped to the pit as needed. The water was not discharging from the pit at the time of the inspection, but the water level was high and there is potential for water stored in the pit to discharge to the nearby ditch.

VIII. Closing Conference

A closing conference was held with Fred Sytsma to discuss our inspection observations. The areas of concern described above were discussed during the closing conference.

Report Completion Date: _____

Lead Inspector Signature: _____

ATTACHMENT A

Photograph Documentation

Photo 1. Looking west at the first of two lagoons with the confinement area behind it. Note the level of manure and the presence of vegetation growing on the manure in the lagoon.

Photo 2. This is a close up of the first lagoon. The arrow points to one of the slots that the manure from the confinement area is scraped through to the lagoon.

Photo 3. This is a picture of a slot from the confinement area looking towards the first lagoon in Photos 1 and 2. Note the level in the lagoon directly on the other side of the fence.

Photo 4. This is a pit that the Sytsma's pump silage leachate from the silage storage area in Photo 5 into. The arrow indicates the unnamed ditch just behind the pit.

Photo 5. One of the silage storage areas. The water in this area is pumped to the pit in Photo 4, which is located on the other side of the tree in this photo.

Photo 6. Another view of the silage storage area in Photo 5.

Photo 7. An aerial view of the Dairy.